



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,458	01/23/2004	Jochen Asbeck	HN 1009 PUS	6756
7590	06/05/2007			
Robert P. Renke Suite 250 28333 Telegraph Road Southfield, MI 48034			EXAMINER LUONG, VINH	
			ART UNIT 3682	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,458

Applicant(s)

ASBECK ET AL.

Examiner

Vinh T. Luong

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2007 and 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


Vinh T. Luong
Primary Examiner

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/23/04 and 5/31/05.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3682

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a camshaft assembly, classified in class 74, subclass 595.
 - II. Claims 12-25, drawn to a method of producing a camshaft, classified in class 29, subclass 8881.1.
 - III. Claims 26-36, drawn to an apparatus for producing lateral indentations in an assembled camshaft, classified in class 29, subclass 6.01.

2. The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

(a) Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown that: (1) the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product; or (2) the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. MPEP § 806.05(f). In the instant case, the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product, such as, a pipe coupling. Alternatively, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as casting or molding;

(b) Inventions III and I are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown that: (1) the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product; or (2) the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus. MPEP § 806.05(g). In this case, the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product, such as, a pipe coupling. Alternatively, the product as

Art Unit: 3682

claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus, such as, a tubular expansion; and/or

(c) Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. MPEP § 806.05(e). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a tubular expansion. Alternatively, the process as claimed can be practiced by hand. For example, one can use the hand to punch the tubular member with a hammer. On the other hand, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as a process for creating an indentation on the outer circumference of a hollow profile.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

Art Unit: 3682

inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. *Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.* Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

7. After Applicant elects Group I, or II, or III, the following restriction takes place:

Art Unit: 3682

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the species of FIGS. 1A-2B, the species of FIGS. 1A-1C, 3A, and 3B, the species of FIGS. 4A and 4B, the species of FIGS. 5A-5D, the species of FIGS. 6A and 6B. The species are independent or distinct because the species: (a) have materially different designs; (b) do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (c) are not obvious variants and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, e.g., Claim 1 is generic for Group I.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

8. Applicant is advised that *the reply to this requirement to be complete must include: (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143); and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.*

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and

Art Unit: 3682

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. A telephone call was made to Mr. Robert P. Renke on May 30, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

10. The drawings were received on May 15, 2007. These drawings are not accepted by the Examiner because the drawing corrections are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 and 1.121(d). See Form PTO-948 attached.

11. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because of the objection in the Office communication on February 15, 2007 and the disapproval of the drawings filed on May 15, 2007 above. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

12. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed May 31, 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information

Art Unit: 3682

or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Applicant submitted only the English abstract of JP 61135434. See MPEP 609.04(b).

13. The information disclosure statements filed on January 23, 2004 and May 31, 2005 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.


Applicant did not include a concise explanation of references AT 005 934 U1, DE 202 04 397 U1, *etc.* in the IDS or specification. Moreover, the English abstracts of these references are not available. See MPEP 609.04(b).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vinh T. Luong whose telephone number is 571-272-7109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Ridley can be reached on 571-272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Luong
May 30, 2007



Vinh T. Luong
Primary Examiner